

Application of: Reed et al.
Serial No.: 10/632,097
Filed: 08/01/2003
Reply to Office Action of 01/02/2009

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable consideration of this application, in view of the present amendment and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-49 are pending. New claim 49 has been added by the present amendment. Claim 35 has been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 21, 24, 26, 30, 31, 34, 36, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kouznetsov (USP 7,240,102). Claims 4, 7-9, 12-20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37-41, 43, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kouznetsov in view of Thomas (USP 6,681,250). Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kouznetsov. Claims 35, and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salama (USP 7,197,549) in view of Thomas. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The office action alleges that Kouznetsov discloses a system in which the IP configuration of a managed appliance is “pushed” to the managed appliance. The office action cites column 2, lines 33, of Kouznetsov where it states that states that network address assignments are “pushed” to devices. In this portion, however, Kouznetsov is describing address assignments in the context of describing the prior art Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (“DHCP”) used to assign addresses. Contrary to Kouznetsov’s generalized “pushed” description, it is well-known in the network computing arts that DHCP is a pull-type of address assignment protocol.

The Salama reference relied upon in the office action describes the DHCP message format. In column 1, lines 53-65, Salama explains that DHCP begins with the client computer broadcasting a DHCP request message to any DHCP server on the network asking for an IP address and configuration parameters (*i.e.*, a DHCP Discover

Application of: Reed et al.
Serial No.: 10/632,097
Filed: 08/01/2003
Reply to Office Action of 01/02/2009

message). If appropriate, the DHCP server responds by offering an IP address to the client (*i.e.*, a DHCP Offer message). If the client chooses to accept the IP address, the client sends a DHCP Request message back to the DHCP server including the offered IP address. The DHCP server then responds with a DHCP Acknowledgement message including the offered IP address and an associated lease time during which the IP address will be valid. (*See also* Salama, col. 7, line 65, through col. 8, line 12; Fig. 7). In this standard DHCP exchange, the client initiated the exchange, and thus, this is a “pull” type operation. Thus, when Kouznetsov describes setting IP addresses in column 2, lines 33-34, Kouznetsov is describing the traditional DHCP exchange in which the client pulls the IP address from the DHCP server.

Each of the independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 12, 21, and 35) recite a system or method in which the IP configuration is pushed to the managed appliance or device. For claims 1, 12, and 21, the office action relies on Kouznetsov, col. 2, line 33, for disclosing the “push” aspect of the claims. For claim 35, the office action relies on Salama, col. 7, line 66, and Figure 7. (*See* April 10, 2008 office action, p. 4). But as explained above, the cited portions of neither Kouznetsov nor Salama teach or suggest a system or method in which the IP configuration is pushed to a managed appliance or device. Instead, both references rely on the traditional DHCP exchange in which the client pulls the IP address from a DHCP server. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable.

In view of the present amendment and remarks above, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Application of: Reed et al.
Serial No.: 10/632,097
Filed: 08/01/2003
Reply to Office Action of 01/02/2009

CHARGE STATEMENT: Deposit Account No. 501860, order no. 2540-0590.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee specifically authorized hereafter, or any missing or insufficient fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith or concerning any paper filed hereafter, and which may be required under Rules 16-18 (missing or insufficiencies only) now or hereafter relative to this application and the resulting Official Document under Rule 20, or credit any overpayment, to our Accounting/ Order Nos. shown above, for which purpose a duplicate copy of this sheet is attached.


This CHARGE STATEMENT does not authorize charge of the issue fee until/unless an issue fee transmittal sheet is filed.

CUSTOMER NUMBER

42624

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Donald L. Jackson

Registration No.: 41,090

Davidson Berquist Jackson & Gowdey, LLP
4300 Wilson Blvd., 7th Floor, Arlington, Virginia 22203
Main: (703) 894-6400 • FAX: (703) 894-6430